



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

JANE DOE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF
JUVENILE JUSTICE, SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL NEEDS, ALL
NIGHT STAFF, YOUTH(S) AND/OR THEIR
PARENTS, FACILITY ADMINISTRATOR
MRS. HEARNS, CAPTAIN FELDER, and
ELIZABETH LEMMOND, *Human*
Resources Director for DDSN,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 3:25-1149-MGL

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION,
SUMMARILY DISMISSING THIS CASE WITHOUT PREJUDICE
AND WITHOUT FURTHER LEAVE FOR AMENDMENT,
AND DEEMING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS**

Plaintiff Jane Doe (Doe), who is representing herself, filed this action against Defendants South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice, South Carolina Department of Special Needs, All Night Staff, Youth(s) and/or Their Parents, Facility Administrator Mrs. Hearn, Captain Felder, and Elizabeth Lemmond, Human Resources Director for DDSN,¹ alleging racial discrimination, wrongful termination, retaliation, defamation, and intentional infliction of emotional distress.

¹ Although prior orders have treated Defendant Elizabeth Lemmond and Human Resources Director for DDSN as separate Defendants, the complaint in this matter lists Defendant Elizabeth Lemmond, Human Resources Director for DDSN.

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending the Court summarily dismiss this case without further leave for amendment. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on April 1, 2025. To date, Doe has failed to file any objections.

“[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845–46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standards set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court this case is summarily **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** and without further leave for amendment.

Because the Court is dismissing this action, Doe’s motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is necessarily **DEEMED AS MOOT**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 8th day of May 2025, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Doe is hereby notified of her right to appeal this Order within sixty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.